A BRIEF

REPLY

TO THE

HISTORY

OF

Standing Armies

In *ENGLAND.*

With ſome Account of the Authors.

The Second Edition.

LONDON:
Printed in the Year 1698.

A REPLY

TO THE

HISTORY

OF

Standing Armies

IN ENGLAND.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
2 JA
1958
CAMBRIDGE

58...1219,20

THE PREFACE.

IN all Ages of the World, and under the Beſt of Governments, there were always ſome Perſons to be found, who either for Envy at the Proſperity of ſome; Ambition, Popular Vanity, or Private Ends, took Occaſion to appear as Male-contents, and ſet themſelves to Expoſe and Cenſure the Actions of Their Governors: Hiſtory is ſo full of Inſtances of this Nature, that 'twould be an affront to the Gentlemen I am dealing with, to ſuppoſe them ignorant of 'em.

In Our Age, where Nick-Names are ſo much in faſhion, we have call'd them Murmurers, Grumbletonians *and the like, of whom one of our Poets has ſaid not improperly.*

And ſhould King *Jeſus* Reign, they'd Murmur too.

'Twould not ha' been foreign to the Purpose, as an Answer to the History of Standing Armies, *to have Entertain'd the World with a* History of these Dissenters to Government, the Murmurers of the World; who always look with sowre Faces upon the Magistrates, and cry out of so much as the little Fingers of their Superiors. *But we have not room for it here; nor to descend too far into the General Character of them; but 'tis necessary to observe, that these sort of People have one inseparable* Adjunct, *as an Essential and Chief Prop both of their Nature and Design; They always Cry* Wo, Wo, *and fright themselves and the World with sad Tidings. Religion, or Liberty, or both, are infallibly the* Ensigns of their Order. *And I wonder we have not Ribbands in their Hats, with* No Popery, No Slavery, *or* No Standing Armies, No Lords of the Treasury, *&c.*

If the Bottom of this Case was to be Examined, and the Authors dealt with in their own way, Preferment always lists them on the t'other side: And tho' I do not say these Gentlemen who write so strenuously for Liberty, would do so; yet they have told us plainly who did, Viz. The Lord Strafford, *and* Noy, *and I could name them some more.* King Charles the First, *say they*, began the Custom of making an Opposition to himself in the House of Commons, the Road to Preferment; *and how came it about?* Truly, because he found they were Mercenary, and made

Noise

a Noiſe that their Mouths might be ſtopp'd; this has been too much a Method ſince, no doubt.

" For Parliament-Men to rail at the Court,
" And get a Preferment immediately for't.

But how comes it to paſs, becauſe private Ends lie ſo generally at the bottom of ſuch Clamour, that we never found them proof againſt the Offer?

And here I could give innumerable Inſtances of great Ones, on the other hand, who as ſoon as ever the Court-Favour has fail'd them, and they found themſelves not Rewarded according to their Merit, turn'd Popular, Champions for the Peoples Liberties, and Railers at the Court. I do not ſay, I mean by this, the Lords S----- D------ *Mr.* H------- *Mr.* H------ *or any body elſe in particular*; but whoever the Coat fits, let them wear it.

This Evil Spirit of Diſcontent is now at Work under the beſt Reign, and the mildeſt Government that ever England *knew; particularly ſo, in ſuffering the Affairs of the Government to be thus diſputed in Print, by, not an Author or Single Perſon, but a whole Club of Miſtaken Politicians, who in any Reign but this would have been us'd as they deſerv'd.*

Had

Had such a Cabal of the best Men in the Nation attempted the like in Queen Eliabeth's *Reign, who we must all acknowledge was a true* English *Queen, and Govern'd the Nation with a Matchless Prudence, they would have been very severely handled; but full Liberty is given them now to say almost any thing; and truly they take the Extent of it, even to Indecency and Ill Manners. For they Treat the King himself with Jeers and Banter, and make Ridiculous Encomiums on him, to expose His Majesty to very Scurrilous Reflections.*

This is so mean a Way of Writing, that I shall not descend to Returns in kind, but shall use them like Gentlemen, whether they behave themselves so or no, and leave that to themselves.

A BRIEF

REPLY

TO THE

Hiſtory of Standing Armies.

THE Outcry againſt an Army in *England* is carried on with ſo high a hand, that nothing can be ſaid to it with any hope of Effect on the Complainants. *They go on with their own Arguments, never thinking any thing that is or can be ſaid to them, worth while to take notice of:* For it ſeems to be more their Deſign to render the Government ſuſpected, than to argue fairly whether it be really true or not, That an Army muſt be our ruine.

I have conſidered their former Books according to their Deſire, and to which they refer in this, and the ſeveral Anſwers to them; ſome of which ſeem to me to carry a great Weight with them; but to them are of ſo ſmall a Conſequence, that they do not think them worth a notice.

They have now given the World what they call a *Hiſtory of Standing Armies*, in which they have been guilty

guilty of ſome Miſtakes, ſome Omiſſions, and ſome Contradictions; and tho' the Hiſtorical part might very well have been omitted, as being nothing at all to the purpoſe; yet 'tis very proper to tell them,

Firſt, 'Tis a Miſtake that the *Spaniards* did any thing to purpoſe in the Seventeen Provinces with 9000 Men, which they call a *Standing Army*; and if they pleaſe to review *Strada* and *Bentivoglio*, their own Authors, they will find that the Duke *D' Alva* and *Don Lewis de Requeſcens* had very great Armies at the Battle near *Groningen*, againſt Count *Lodowick* of *Naſſau*, and at the Sieges of *Harlem* and *Mons*; the Duke *D' Alva* brought Fourteen thouſand Men with him at firſt; raiſed Twenty-four thouſand more at another time againſt the Siege of *Mons*; and when the Count *D'Egmont* preſented the Petition againſt the Foreign Forces, they alledg'd the *Spaniards* had Thirty thouſand Men in Pay, beſides the Troops of the Country.

As to other Armies, I wonder the Authors did not inſtance the ſmall Forces with which the *Spaniards* conquer'd the Mighty Empires of *Mexico* and *Peru*; in all which Work, I never yet read that they had above 800 Horſe and 5750 Foot.

Armies, as well as every thing elſe, are great or ſmall in proportion; and 4000 Archers in *Cheſhire* rais'd by *Richard* the Second, though they only made way to their Maſter's Ruin, were really a more formidable Force than Twenty thouſand men in Arms can be now.

The

The Authors (for I am inform'd their Name is *Legion*) have carri'd on their Hiſtory to Queen *Mary*, and there break off, and tell us, the Standing Forces were then 1200 men, in Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign 3500; where, by the way, 'tis to be noted, they grant, that it has all along been allowed to have a Standing Force in *England* for above 140 Years paſt; for we are not now arguing the Quantity, but the Thing, *A Standing Army*: And they have often in former Papers aſſerted, That any Standing Forces are deſtructive of our Conſtitution, and inconſiſtent with the *Engliſh* Liberty; and yet our Conſtitution conſiſted very well in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time. ——Nor have theſe Gentlemen given their Quotations faithfully; for they have been told, and are not ignorant, That, Firſt, whereas Queen *Mary* had but 1200 men, ſhe ſhamefully loſt *Calais* to the *French*, for want of Strength to relieve it. Indeed if ſhe had rais'd the Militia, they might ha' kept the *French* from coming on to take *Dover*, but if ſhe had had 10000 men in Pay, *Calais*, which had been ours for ſome Ages before, had been ours ſtill; and if it had, the Loſs of *Dunkirk* had not been ſo much to our diſadvantage. Then, as to Queen *Elizabeth*, they omit that ſhe always had a very good Army in the *Low-Countries*, which to her was a Nurſery of Soldiers: And in the time of her apprehenſion of an Invaſion, I would ask how many ſhe tranſported hither for her own Defence; for the Armies ſhe prepar'd, at *Tilbury* Camp 44000, and 20000 at *Plimouth*, were not all Militia, but Soldiers diſciplin'd and train'd in the Wars in *Ireland* and *Holland*.

What the Authors ſay Queen *Elizabeth* did, and with what Glory ſhe reign'd, and how ſhe left us when ſhe died, is all true, and much more; and what her Revenue was, and what Taxes ſhe had, for ought we know may be ſo: But I hope theſe Gentlemen will excuſe me for ſaying they very much miſrepreſent the Caſe, when they would tell us what Revenues ſhe had; as if thoſe Revenues perform'd all the Great Things ſhe did: They ought to have told us alſo what Taxes ſhe had, and how ſhe took from the *Spaniard* above 60 Millions of Pieces of Eight at ſeveral times, at the *Weſt-Indies*, at *Cadiz*, and at Sea; which together with what Subſidies, Cuſtoms of Towns, and Intereſts the *Dutch* paid her, were Infinite: And with this ſhe did all thoſe great things, and with this ſhe always kept an Army on foot, and left them ſo after the Peace; by the ſame token that King *James* let 3000 of them ſtarve and deſert for want of Subſiſtence, on the *Dutch* refuſing to pay the Gariſons of the *Brill*, *Ramekins*, and *Fluſhing*.

I ſhall not enter into the Hiſtory of King *James* the Firſt, King *Charles* the Firſt, or his Sons; the Hiſtorical part does not argue either way in this Caſe, as I underſtand the Point: The Queſtion before us is not ſo much what has been, or has not been, but what is now needful to be done; and I wiſh theſe Gentlemen would admit a calm Argument; in which Caſe I offer to prove, Firſt, That 'tis abſolutely neceſſary to have ſome Standing Force; and then, That with Conſent of Parliament 'tis not Illegal.

I remember

I remember one Reply to the former Argument entred into the Hiſtorical part of the matter, and undertook to prove, That every Government in *England* had for many Years maintain'd ſome Standing Force; and 'tis too true to be denied.

Then they deſcend to examine the Reign of King *James* the Firſt, and of K. *Charles* the Firſt; and tho' they grant they had no Armies, yet they reckon up all the Tyrannies and Oppreſſions they were guilty of; how they Enſlav'd the Nation, Buffoon'd the Parliament, Oppreſs'd the Subjects, Levied Taxes; but all without a Standing Army: Nay, when King *Charles* the Firſt affronted the *Houſe of Commons*, he was fain, as theſe Authors themſelves ſay, to Rifle the Taverns, Gaming-houſes, and Brothel-houſes, to pick out 3 or 400 Men; which if true, tho' I do not ſee it deſerves any credit; yet 'tis plain he could have no Army, no, not ſo much as any Guards. Now if all this can be done by a King without an Army, why then the having an Army can do no more; the Miſchief does not lie in an Army, but in the Tyrant.

The Authors conclude of King *Charles* the Firſt *having No Army to ſupport him, his Tyranny was precarious, and at laſt his ruin.* And may we not ſay ſo of his Son, who had a great Army, and as Mercenary as any *Engliſh* Army ever was? And yet tho' he had an Army to ſupport him, *his Tyranny was precarious, and at laſt his ruin:* So that *Tyranny* is a Weed that never throve in *England*; it always poiſon'd the Planter; and an Army, or no Army, it is all one.

This is only toucht at, to let the World know, that these Gentlemen have not been faithful Historians; for that they have not fairly stated the Case, but left out such things as are really true, because against their purpose; which is not a fair way of Arguing.

But if the Case must be debated, I think 'tis very proper to reduce it to Two Heads:

First, Whether a Standing Army, in time of Peace, may not be Lawful?

Secondly, Whether it be not Expedient?

As to the first Question, it has really been prov'd in a small Discourse formerly published, entituled, *An Argument*, shewing that a Standing Army is not inconsistent, &c. which these Gentlemen never thought fit to Answer, and now do tacitly acknowledge to be true, but say 'tis nevertheless dangerous: However, if it may be Legal then, it cannot be true that 'tis destructive of our Liberty and Constitution; for that can never be destructive of our Constitution which can be Legal; That were to make a thing Lawful and Unlawful at the same time.

A Standing Army, with Consent of Parliament, is a Legal Army; and if the Legislative Power erect an Army, 'tis as much a Qualification to the Army, as a Charter is to a Corporation; for what else do these Gentlemen call an Establishment? that cannot be Illegal which

which is done by Parliament. The Titles of a *Bankrupt House of Lords*, a *Penſioner House of Commons*, a *flattering Clergy*, and a *proſtituted Miniſtry*, are virulent Phraſes, and ſavour both of Paſſion and Ill Manners. We have them not now, nor am I convinc'd we ever had, nor hope we ever ſhall.

And yet if they were ſo, they are the Parliament of *England*; and what they do, is the Act of the whole Kingdom, and cannot be Illegal.

I ſhall not ſpend time to prove what the Authors own, and cannot deny. I therefore lay down the firſt Head as proved before, and granted by our Adverſaries;

That a Standing Army in time of Peace with Conſent of Parliament, is not inconſiſtent with a Free Government, and is a Legal Army.

The Second main Argument is, Whether it be neceſſary? for all things that are lawful, are not expedient. Whether there be ſo much need of an Army, as that we ſhould run the hazards that we are told we ſhall be expos'd to, from them.

That we have very great Reaſon to be always in a Poſture fit to maintain the Peace purchaſed now with ſo much Blood and Treaſure, I believe no Body will diſpute. Whether with or without an Army, I don't yet debate. That an Army was the procuring Cauſe of this Peace, I hope it will be allow'd me; and that had we not appear'd in a very powerful Figure, the Terms had not

been

been ſo good, and *Lewis* the 14*th* would not have parted with ſo many Vaſt Countries, Impregnable Fortifications, and Sovereign Titles; our Army in Conjunction with our Allies have under God's Providence obtain'd this. Now, whether it be proper to let go this Lyon upon Parole, and tying the *French* King by his Honour only, which he has not formerly valued at much in ſuch Caſes; Disband our Forces, and rely upon the League? This is the direct Queſtion.

If the King of *France* were ſo much to be depended upon, the *Spaniard* and the *Emperor* need not have ſtrain'd ſo hard for the ſtrong Towns of *Briſac*, *Friburg*, *Philipsburgh*, *Mons*, *Aeth*, *Luxemburgh*, and *Charleroy*, which are very chargeable to keep, and no real Profit to them; and the King of *France* would readily have given up *Franche-Compte*, *Burgundy*, and vaſt Territories of Land inſtead of them, with large Revenues and Advantages; but theſe are given as Pledges of the Peace, and are maintain'd by the Confederates at a vaſt Charge, that they might have a ſufficient Strength to oblige the *French* King to perform the Stipulation of the League.

Now I do not know what vaſt Securities theſe Gentlemen may flatter themſelves with; but to me it ſeems one of the moſt ridiculous things in the World to be wholly Diſarm'd at ſuch a time, when all the Nations in the World have Forces in Pay.

I am willing to give the Gentlemen of the Club all the Latitude in Argument they can deſire, and therefore I'll grant that the *French* King has ſurrendred all the

Towns

Towns and Countries he was to ſurrender, though he really has not. That King *James* is neither in Power nor Perſon at all formidable, nor indeed worth mentioning in the Caſe. That the King of *Spain* is not Dead, nor like to be ſo. That theſe are not, nor ever were Arguments for a Standing Force, at leaſt not ſingly conſidered.

But notwitſtanding all this, I cannot but ſay that ſome competent Standing Force is abſolutely neceſſary to preſerve that Peace which has coſt the Nation ſo dear; and it would ſeem a moſt unaccountable Weakneſs to run the hazard of it, and expoſe us to the uncertainty of it: We ſay, *Temptation makes a Thief.* There is nothing in the World will be ſo likely to make the Peace precarious, and allure the *French* to break it, as to find us Naked and Defenceleſs.

If it be true, that an Army may be dangerous at Home, 'tis as true, that having no Army muſt be fatal Abroad: The danger of an Army is uncertain, and may be none; the damage of the contrary is infallible. 'Tis not ſaying we have formerly Conquer'd *France*, and therefore ought not to be ſo frighted with Apprehenſions of it now all the *French* Fools they ſay are Dead. *France* now, without Reflection upon *England*, is much too ſtrong a Match for any ſingle Nation in *Europe*, and the only means to keep her within bounds, is by Confederacies, and *Leagues Offenſive*; how theſe can be maintain'd without *Quota's* of Forces ready to unite, is a Myſtery too dark for my Underſtanding. Indeed the King may ſay to his Confederates, "Truly my Subjects

"won't

"won't truſt me with any Soldiers, and therefore I "muſt pay my proportion in Money. But other Coun-"tries may refuſe to keep up Forces as well as we, and ſo a League would be to ſmall purpoſe indeed. Theſe things have been offer'd before now, and in better Terms, and the Gentlemen with whom we argue have thought fit to forget to ſpeak to them.

But now we are Banter'd about a Fleet and a Militia, and theſe are the Equivalents with which all the pretences of a Standing Army are to be Anſwer'd. Indeed a Fleet well ordered is a good thing; and a Militia well regulated, *That Black Swan, that unheard-of thing*, if ever it could be had would be a good thing too. But pray, Gentlemen, give ſome people leave to underſtand things in the World as well as you: Suppoſe this Fleet and this Militia to be all that you can pretend; what would this be to a War in *Flanders*? 'Tis the carrying the War into *Flanders*, that is our great Intereſt; the Barrier of Strong Towns there is our beſt Security againſt *France* in the World: Now ſuppoſe the *French* King ſhould with 80000 men fall into thoſe Countries like a Tempeſt, as he did in 1672, without declaring War, would our Militia go over with the King to help our Confederates? Or could our Fleet relieve *Charleroy*? Would raiſing an Army, though it could be done in forty days, as you ſay King *Charles* did, be quick enough? 'Tis ſtrange theſe things are not worth while to conſider: Why does the *French* King keep up an Army? 'Tis not for fear, but to increaſe his Glory; and for that very reaſon it would be prepoſterous for us to be naked.

England

England has always gone hand in hand with the Times; and Arm'd or not Arm'd, as her Neighbours did, and muſt always do ſo: in the Days when we kept no Forces at home, our Neighbours kept none abroad, and then there was no need of it, we were as well provided as they; but now they are all ſtrong in Men, and ſhall we be naked! that is certainly be to expoſed?

"'Tis Argued, an Army may ſoon be raiſed; "King *Charles* the Second raiſed an Army in Forty "Days, and the preſent King very ſpeedily. I would but deſire theſe Gentlemen to Examine, how it fared with both thoſe Armies? I ſaw them both and they were compoſed of as jolly, brave, young Fellows as ever were ſeen; but being raw, and not us'd to hardſhip, the firſt Army lay, and rotted in *Flanders*, with Agues and Fluxes, the very firſt Campaign; and the laſt did the like at *Dundalk*; and ſo 'twill always fare with any Army of *Engliſh* Men, 'till they have been abroad, and inur'd to the Service. I appeal to any Man, who knows the Nature of our Men; they are the worſt raw Men in the World, and the beſt when once got over it.

But to return to the Point: If 'tis neceſſary to preſerve our Peace, and maintain the Leagues and Confederacies, which are the Bands and Barrs of it; if 'tis neceſſary to be always ready to prevent an Affront of an Enemy? if 'tis neceſſary to ſupport the Reputation of our *Engliſh* Power? 'tis neceſſary then to be, not only in a poſture to Defend our ſelves at home, but to Defend our Confederates abroad, and to aſſiſt them in

any ſudden Inſult from the Enemy; and this can be done neither by a Fleet, nor a Militia.

But to come further: We have been Invaded in *England*, notwithſtanding our Fleet; and that many times. *Henry* the Seventh Landed with an Army in ſpight of *Richard* the Third and his Fleet. The Duke of *Monmouth* Landed in the *Weſt*, tho' King *James* had a very good Fleet: And had not King *James*'s ſtanding Army, tho' that was but Two Thouſand Men, there routed them; I appeal to all Men to judge, what could the Militia have done to him? Now I'le ſuppoſe the Duke of *Monmouth* had been a *French* Man, or any thing, he had time to Land and Invade us, and unlade his Arms, and might have ſent his Ships away again, and never have been hindred by our Fleet; and had he been but 5000 Regular Men, he had beat King *James* out of his Kingdom. Again, his Men were raw, a meer Militia, and you ſee what came of it, they were Defeated by a quarter of their Number, tho' I muſt ſay, they were better than any of our Militia too, by much.

Again, the *Prince* of *Orange* Landed his whole Army quickly, notwithſtanding a Fleet, and had leiſure enough to have ſent away all his Ships again: So that 'tis a miſtake, to ſay we cannot be Invaded if we have a Fleet, for we have been Invaded tho' we have had a good Fleet; and Demonſtration is beyond Argument. And I would undertake, without Vanity, to Invade *England*, from any part beyond Sea, without any fear

of

of the Fleet, unleſs you will have a Fleet able to block up your Neighbours Ports; and when you hear of any Ships fitting out any where, ſend and forbid them, as Queen *Elizabeth* did to *Henry* the 4th of *France*.

Now if I could come ſafe on Shore, notwithſtanding the Fleet, then, if you have no Army to oppoſe me with, but your Country Militia, I would but ask any underſtanding Soldier, how many Men he would require to Conquer the whole Nation? Truly, not a great many; for, I dare ſay, 40000 of the beſt Militia we have, back'd with no diſciplin'd Troops, would not Fight 8000 old Soldiers: The Inſtance of the *Iniskilling* Men in *Ireland* will not bear here; for, on the one hand, they were Men made deſperate by the ruin of their Families and Eſtates, and exaſperated to the higheſt degree, and had no recourſe for their Lives but to their Arms; and on the other hand, the *Iriſh* were the moſt deſpicable ſcandalous Fellows the World ever ſaw; Fellows that ſhut their Eyes when they ſhot off their Muſquets, and *tied Strings about their right Hands to know them from their left:* Theſe are wretched Inſtances, and only prove what we knew before, that the Militia are always brave Soldiers when they have to do with Children or Fools; but what could our Militia have done to the *P.* of *O.* old *Veteran* Troops, had they been willing to have oppoſed him; truly juſt as much as King *James* did, *run away.*

The Story of making them uſeful has been much talk'd of, and a Book was printed to that purpoſe; it were a good Project, if practica-

ble, but I think the Attempt will never be made by any wise Man, because no such will go upon Impossibilities.

War is no longer an Accident, but a Trade, and they that will be any thing in it, must serve a long Apprenticeship to it: Human Wit and Industry has rais'd it to such a Perfection, and it is grown such a piece of Mannage, that it requires People to make it their whole Employment; the War is now like the Gospel, Men must be set apart for it; the Gentlemen of the Club may say what they please, and talk fine things at home of the natural Courage of the *English*, but I must tell them, Courage is now grown less a Qualification of a Soldier than formerly; not but that 'tis necessary too, but Mannagement is the principle Art of War. An Instance of this may be had no farther off than *Ireland*, what a pitiful piece of Work the *Irish* made of a War all Men know: now 'tis plain the *Irish* do not want Courage, for the very same Men, when sent abroad, well Train'd, and put under exact Discipline, how have they behav'd themselvs in *Piemont* and *Hungary*, they are allow'd to be as good Troops as any in the Armies.

And if the state of Things alter, we must alter our Posture too, and what then comes of the *History of Standing Armies*? Tho' there had never been any in the World, they may be necessary now, and so absolutely necessary, as that we cannot be safe without them.

We must now examine a little the Danger of a Standing Army at home; in which it will appear,

pear, whether the Gentlemen of the Club are in the right, when they turn all the Stream of the Government into one Channel, as if they all drove but one Wheel, and as if the whole Deſign of the King and his Miniſters were to obtain the deſpotick Power, and to Govern by an Army.

They do indeed Careſs the King ſometimes with large Encomiums; but on the other hand, they ſpeak it as directly as Engliſh can expreſs, "They intimate to us, that he deſign'd the Go-"vernment by an Army, even before he came o-"ver; and therefore in his Declaration omited "to promiſe the Disbanding it. I wiſh theſe Gentlemen would leave out their Raillery, as a thing that never helps an Argument, —— as Mr. *Dryden* ſays.

——*For Diſputants, when Reaſons fail,*
Have one ſure Refuge left, and that's to rail.

However, we ſhall not treat them in the ſame manner. I cannot think all thoſe Artifices of the Court, (for a Standing Army) are true, and ſome of them are plain Forgories. "*To tell us* "*the Parliament thought*, they might have mannag-"ed their part of the War by Sea. That the word "*Authority of Parliament* was urg'd to that Ar-"ticle of the Declaration of Right, about Stand-"ing Armies, by ſuch as deſign'd ſo early to play "the Game of a Standing Army: That the King-"dom of *Ireland* was neglected, and *London-Derry* "not Reliev'd; that a pretence for a greater Army "might be fram'd. Theſe are horrid ſuggeſtions,

and

and ſavour only of ill Nature; and it may be very eaſy, had I leiſure to examine, to prove to thoſe Gentlemen, that the Parliament had as great a Senſe of the neceſſity of Force to reduce *Ireland*, as the King had, and were as forward to grant Supplies for it. When the King told the Houſe, that 'twas not adviſable to attempt it without 20000 Men. If theſe Gentlemen had ask'd who adviſed his Majeſty to ſay ſo, I could ha' told them, Duke *Schomberge* himſelf did it.; a Man who was much a Soldier, and as honeſt as ever Commanded an Army; a General of the greateſt Experience of any of his Age, who no Man could deſpiſe without our Reproach to his Judgment; a Man us'd to Conquering of Kingdoms and Armies; and yet he thought it very unſafe to Fight with that Army at *Dundalk*. And we were beholding to his Conduct for the ſaving the whole Nation by that Caution, tho' Thouſands loſt their Lives by it, and ſome fooliſhly reflected on him for want of Courage; which 'twas thought, coſt him his Life at the *Boyne*. King *James* had 50000 Men in *Ireland*, furniſhed with every thing neceſſary but a General; and can any body ſay, that to attempt reducing them with leſs than 20000, was a pretence to get an Army.

This is ſtraining a Text, a Trade, (without reflection) which our Adverſaries are very ready at; but which is more uſeful for them, in their *Socinian* Principles, than in their Politicks.

By this, I muſt beg leave to tell the Gentlemen, it moſt plainly appears, that they drive at Villifying

ing the preſent Eſtabliſhment; rather than at the Liberty they talk ſo much of.

The next abſurdity I find, is *Page* 23. Where, tho' they do not affirm, becauſe like cunning Diſputants, they won't hamper themſelves in Argument, yet they plainly intimate, that all the omiſſions of our Fleet were deſign'd to produce this Argument from it, that a Fleet is no Security to us. As if his Majeſty, or his Miniſters, ſhould Order our Fleet to do nothing Conſiderable, and ſpend Six or Seven Years, and as many Millions of Mony, only to be able to ſay to the Parliament, *that a Fleet is no Security to us.* This is ſuch a thing, that I cannot paſs over, without deſiring theſe Gentlemen to Examine a little, whether his Majeſty has not, on the contrary, more improv'd our Fleet and Shipping, than any King before him ever did? Whether he has not built more Ships, and by his own Fancy, peculiar in that way, better Ships than any of his Predeceſſors? Whether the Docks, the Yards, the Stores, the Saylors, and the Ships, are not in the beſt Condition that ever *England* knew? Whether the King has not in all his Speeches to the Parliament, and in all the ſtate of the Navy laid before them, put forward, to his utmoſt, the greatneſs of the Navy? Whether the Decoration of the Navy and Stores, are not regulated by him, to a degree never before put in practice; and whether, now the war is over, he has not taken care to have the greateſt Fleet in the World, and in the beſt poſture for Action? And is all this to let us know that a Fleet is no Security to us? I bluſh

for

for these Gentlemen, when I think they should thus fly in the Faces of their own Arguments; and abuse the Care his Majesty has taken for that Security, which they ought to look on, with as much satisfaction, as our Enemies do with Concern.

Besides, I do not remember that ever the King, or any of his Ministers, offered to lessen the value of a good Fleet in any of their Speeches, or Discourses; if so, to what end have they been so careful of it, and why have we a Registring Act to secure Men for it, and a Royal Foundation at *Greenwich* Hospital to incourage them? why so many Bounties given to the Sea-men, and such vast Stores laid in to increase and continue them?

But must we not distinguish things? Our Defence is of two sorts, and so must be our Strength. Our Fleet is an undeniable defence and security for us; and we will grant, to oblige them, whether so, or no, that both the Fleet and our Militia, which they are so fond of, are as great a Security at home as they can desire; but 'tis plain, and they cannot pretend to deny it, they are neither of them any thing to *Flanders*; which all the World will own must be the Scene of a War when ever it begins. To say we may assist with Mony, is to say nothing; for Men may be wanting as much as Mony; and are so too, and have been so this War at an unusual rate.

These

Theſe Arguments might be inlarg'd, even to a Twelve-penny Book, like the Author's, if the Printer deſir'd it; but ſhort as they are, they cannot be rationally confuted.

"The Gentlemen who argue thus againſt Force, "have taken upon them to lay down a Method, "how to aſſiſt *Spain*, in caſe of a War, by bring-"ing Soldiers from *Final*; not leting us know, if we did not enquire, that thoſe Forces muſt Sail by *Thoulon*, and that we muſt have a great Fleet in the *Straights* for that Service, or they will be prevented; nor not enquiring which way thoſe Troops ſhall come at *Final*, while the Duke of *Savoy* poſſeſſes *Montferrat*, and all the higher part of *Italy* for the *French*: If they could argue no better than they can guide a War, if their Logic was not better than their Geography, they would make poor work of their Argument.

But, becauſe they ſeem to underſtand ſuch things, I would fain ask theſe Gentlemen, if a War ſhould break out now in the Empire, between the Papiſts and the Proteſtants, which a Man, without the Spirit of Propheſie, may ſay is very likely; pray which way would theſe Gentlemen have the King aid the Proteſtants in the *Palatinate*, what Service could our Fleet and Militia do in this Caſe. Why, ſay our Gentlemen, *we may aid them with Mony*. So did King *James* the Firſt, after a moſt wretched manner, tho' his own Daughter was to loſe her Patrimony by it; and the Proteſtant Intereſt in *Germany*, which now is in more hazard than ever it was ſince *Guſtavus Adolphus* his time, muſt be ſupported by the Leagues and Confederacies, which

our King must make, and our Forces uphold, or 'tis a great question whether it will be supported at all.

England is to be considered in several Capacities, though these Gentlemen seem to confine themselves to *England* within it self; *England* is at this time, the Head of two Leagues, both which are essentially necessary to the preservation of our Welfare: One a League of Property, and the other of Religion. One a League against *French* Slavery, and the other a League against *German* Popery; and we can maintain neither of these without some Strength. I could tell these Gentlemen, That while they would disarm us to protect our Liberties, they strike a fatal Stroke at our Religion, which, I confess, I ought not to expect they should value, because I know their Principles to be both Irreligious and Blasphemous.

After all that has been said, 'twere not amiss to examine what this Army is we speak of, and how to be maintain'd; for these Gentlemen argue all along upon a great Army, enough to subject a Kingdom; and to raise it up to a magnitude, they have gone into *Ireland* and *Scotland*, and rak'd into the Settlement of those Kingdoms to muster up a great Army; though after all, their Calculations are wrong, almost a third part. In short, they have reckon'd up small and great to make up the number. To which it is convenient to reply.

First,

First, What Forces are maintain'd in *Scotland* and *Ireland*, is nothing to the purpose; for both the Parliaments of those Kingdoms have concurr'd; and found it necessary, though these Gentlemen think otherwise.

Secondly, If the King does see it proper to have some Forces ready on such Occasions as we have discours'd, but, to ease us of our Jealousies and Fears, keeps them in other Kingdoms, and with consent of those Kingdoms; is not the *English* Nation so much the more oblig'd to him for his tenderness of their Safety and Satisfaction?

Thirdly, Why do not the Gentlemen as well argue against his having the Seal-holdership of *Holland*, by virtue of which he can, when ever he pleases, command over Ten or Twenty Thousand Men from thence, to enslave us when there is no War abroad. For it seems the Distance of the Army is no safety to us.

To go on, we have the War at an end, the King has dismiss'd the foreign Troops, disbanded Ten Regiments at home, besides Horse and Dragroons; most of the Scots abroad, sent Twelve Regiments to *Ireland*, and broke them there, and reduced the Army to so small a degree, as that much cannot be fear'd from them, nor fewer can hardly consist with our Safety; and yet these are the Grievances we are to be so terrify'd at, that nothing but Slavery must be the consequence.

Neither has any attempt been made to make this Army perpetual, nor has any number been prescrib'd. But such an Army, so proportioned, so qualified, and such a regulation as the Parlia-

ment ſhall ſee needful, may be legal, muſt be neceſſary, and cannot be dangerous: And to the King and Parliament we may with Satisfaction refer it. The Parliament will conſent to no Force, but ſuch as they ſhall judge ſafe and neceſſary; and the King will inſiſt on no other Army than the Parliament conſents to; and while they agree to it, why ſhould we be concern'd. For while the King allows the diſpoſal of the Army to the Vote of the Parliament, by which they may be either continued or diſmiſſed, no future danger can appear; unleſs a Parliament ſhall part with that Power, which in this Reign is not likely to be deſir'd of them.

The CONCLUSION.

I Cannot paſs over this Matter without a ſhort Reflection upon the Perſons and Deſigns of the Authors of this, and the like Pamphlets againſt the Government, and to enter a little into the Hiſtory of their Practices for ſome years paſt.

His Majeſty has found the influence of their more ſecret Actions, during the War, in their Delaying and Diſappointing of Funds and Supplies, which, two Years together, prolong'd the War, and had like to have been fatal to the

Army in *Flanders*, who went without Pay longer than any Army in the World (but themſelves) would have done; and let his Majeſty know, that they would not only Fight for him, but Starve for him, if there was occaſion; and which his Majeſty took great notice of in his Speeches at the opening of the next Parliament.

After this, they ſet up for Male-Contents, and always went about Town, complaining of miſ-management, ill Officers, State Miniſters, and the like: Angry that they were not preferr'd, and envying all that were; crying out, we muſt have Peace, and we ſhould be ruin'd by the War; magnifying the Power of the *French*, which now they Undervalue ſo much; and ſaying, we ſhould be ſubdued by the Power of *France*, if we did not ſave our ſelves by a Peace; and the like.

At laſt, the King, contrary to their Expectations, and falſe Propheſies, brought the *French* to Terms ſafe and honourable; and a Peace has been obtain'd as good as was not only expected, but deſired.

This was no ſooner done, but they ſtrike at the Root; and now for fear of his hurting us, we muſt diſarm the King, and leave him no more Weapons than ſhould be truſted to a Child, or a Mad Man: And in order to ſecure us from a Tyrant, the whole Nation muſt be diſarm'd, our Confederates deſerted, and all the Leagues and Treaties (made for mutual Defence and Security) be broken, and the King left unable to perform the Poſtulata's of his own part. In or-

der to this, they appear in Print, and setting up as Champions of the Peoples Liberty, form'd themselves into a Club, and appear openly both in Print, and publick Discourses; and being all of them maintainers of the most infamous Heresie of *Socinus*, they bid defiance to the Son of God on one hand, and to the King and Government on the other.

And that their Blasphemy might go hand in hand with their Politicks, they Publish'd two *Socinian* Books, and two Books against the Army, almost together.

Much about the same time, from the same people, came out into the World, two Volumes of *Ludlow's Memoirs*, in all which, the Conduct of the Parliament against the King is exceedingly magnified; the Government of a single Person opposed, covertly under the Person of *O. C.* but in general, of any single Person whatever; and all the Common Wealth Principles advanced and defended.

And having much Work of this sort to do, and being under some Fears of a restraint, from an Act for Regulating the Press, they endeavoured to ward off that Blow by publishing a Book for the Liberty of the Press, which they managed with such Artifice, that the Bill was not past, and so their Fears vanish't.

This was a Victory they knew how to make use of, and it was immediately followed by a publication of Coll. *Sidney's* Maxims of Government, writ against *Filmer*; for which the Author dyed

a

a Martyr, and of which one of the Publiſhers had the impudence to ſay it was the beſt Book, the Bible excepted, that ever came abroad in the World. And that he went no farther, I'll aſſure you the Pen-men of the holy Scripture were very much beholding to him.

And now from the ſame Forge is hammer'd out the *Hiſtory of the Standing Armies*, in which all the Artifice in the World is made uſe of, to ſet things in a falſe light, to raiſe the Cry of Tyranny and Deſpotick Government, which has been ſo long abdicated; to decry ſtate Miniſters, ridicule our Settlement, banter the King, and terrifie the People. And to this I muſt add an impudent Libel, to direct the Honourable Houſe of Commons in chuſing a Speaker.

And that it might have its due force, to ſow Diſſention and Diſagreement between the King and his People, both theſe attacks made againſt the Army were tim'd to appear juſt at the opening of the Parliament, and ſo induſtriouſly handed about, that they have been ſeen in the remoteſt Countries of *England* before they were publiſhed in *London*.

'Tis hoped theſe Circumſtances will a little open the Eyes of the World, and teach us to mark ſuch as ſow Diviſions among us, and not to meddle with thoſe who are given to Change.

But to leave the matter to the Parliament, who are proper Judges of the Fact, and have always been very careful both of our Liberty and our Safety.

FINIS.

2 JA 1958 CAMBRIDGE